

Lantos	Orton	Spratt
Levin	Owens	Stark
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Stenholm
Lipinski	Pastor	Stokes
LoBiondo	Payne (NJ)	Studds
Lofgren	Payne (VA)	Stupak
Lowe	Pelosi	Tanner
Luther	Peterson (FL)	Taylor (MS)
Manton	Peterson (MN)	Tejeda
Markey	Pickett	Thompson
Martinez	Pomeroy	Thornton
Mascara	Poshard	Thurman
Matsui	Rahall	Torres
McCarthy	Rangel	Torricelli
McDermott	Reed	Towns
McHale	Richardson	Velázquez
McNulty	Rivers	Vento
Meehan	Roemer	Visclosky
Meek	Rose	Volkmer
Menendez	Roybal-Allard	Ward
Miller (CA)	Rush	Waters
Mineta	Sabo	Watt (NC)
Minge	Sanders	Waxman
Mink	Sawyer	Williams
Montgomery	Schroeder	Wise
Moran	Schumer	Woolsey
Nadler	Scott	Wyden
Neal	Skaggs	Wynn
Obey	Skelton	Yates
Oliver	Slaughter	

NOT VOTING—27

Bishop	Maloney	Reynolds
Brown (FL)	McDade	Riggs
Deal	McKinney	Sanford
Fattah	Mfume	Serrano
Foley	Moakley	Sisisky
Geren	Mollohan	Smith (NJ)
Green	Morella	Tucker
Harman	Oberstar	Waldholtz
Lincoln	Ortiz	Wilson

□ 1731

Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. MANTON changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. SOUDER. Mr. Speaker, I, reluctantly voted for the previous question in spite of my desire to support the Senate gift ban. I personally have implemented the Senate gift ban in my office. While the golf and tennis trips worth thousands of dollars to Members usually benefit charity as well as the Members, there is no question in my mind that these primarily recreational trips should be eliminated as a Member's perk. The American people are demanding that we reform this system of expensive dinners, gifts, and trips. The question is not whether or not people believe the other party. They don't trust them either. Citizens are fed up with both parties because they believe we work too closely with those who give us financial benefits—personal and political. Our large freshman Republican class was elected largely on Government reform. We are not likely to remain if we don't progress on real reform—of Congress itself, or PACS, of gifts, of term limits. I will continue to sponsor legislation on these issues, as well as voluntarily implement them in my office. While ultimately this is a question of integrity and character, I sincerely hope that our leadership will begin voting on these issues soon because previous Congresses have spent the public's full measure of trust.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. HASTINGS of Washington). The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

LIMITING DEBATE ON CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1854, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that debate on the conference report to accompany H.R. 1854 be limited to 10 minutes each, equally divided between myself and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. (Mr. LINDER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the consideration of the conference report to H.R. 1854, making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes, and that I may include extraneous and tabular material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1854, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 206, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1854) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the conference report is considered as having been read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of July 28, 1995, at page H7964.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the order of the House, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] and the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] each will be recognized for 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD].

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, it is pleasure to present the conference report on the 1996 legislative branch appropriations bill. This is the first 1996 appropriations bill to come out of conference, but there are a number close behind us.

The conference report presents a bill that will greatly reduce the size of our own branch of Government.

To summarize, the conference agreement provides budget authority of \$2.18 billion. This is \$433 million below the President's budget request, a 16.5 percent reduction. It is \$205.7 million

below fiscal year 1995; that's an 8.6 percent reduction in funding below the current year. This agreement reduces legislative branch jobs [FTE's] by 2,614 under fiscal year 1995, Senate staffing excluded; that's a 9.5 percent reduction in jobs. Finally, the conference agreement is \$114.7 million below our 602(b) budget resolution target.

The House and Senate concluded a successful conference.

There were 55 amendments to the House bill, all were resolved by the conferees.

I will include a table showing details and a list of the highlights of the conference agreement.

We have compared the conference agreement to the House bill.

The bill we sent to the Senate did not have funds for Senate operations.

Excluding the Senate items, the conference agreement is \$9,518,000 below the House-passed bill. The reductions to the House bill consist of: \$18,458,000 further reduction to GAO; \$4,511,000 further reduction in congressional printing; \$903,000 reduced from the Joint Committee on Taxation; \$1,060,000 further reduction in the power plant; \$14,999,000 reduced from Congressional Research Service in order to restore Library of Congress funding; \$7,000,000 from the Botanic Garden Conservatory renovation which eliminates the funds to begin that project.

There were several additions to the House bill, including: \$2,500,000 for a joint Office of Compliance; \$3,615,000 for an orderly shutdown of the Office of Technology Assessment; \$50,000 for Capitol buildings maintenance; \$17,753,000 was restored to the funding of the Library of Congress; and \$13,995,000 was added back for the depository library program under the Superintendent of Documents.

There were several provisions included, primarily to facilitate the operations of the House and Senate. The conference report (House Report 104-212) has been available for several weeks and explains these provisions.

One of these provisions is contained in amendment No. 10 which provides \$6,115,000 for the orderly shutdown of the Office of Technology Assessment and includes provisions for severance pay and disposal of property.

Amendment No. 55 includes some House housekeeping provisions added by the managers and a provision that establishes an awards and settlement fund required by the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995.

In addition to the overall reductions I have already enumerated, a few of the highlights include:

House of Representatives—has been cut \$57.2 million—\$57,174,000—below 1995. Included in this reduction, committee staff have been cut 33 percent; committee budgets have been reduced by \$39.8 million—\$39,762,000—House administrative offices have been cut by \$11.9 million below 1995—\$11,934,000—

and administrative staff have been reduced by 313 FTE's.

Senate—has been cut \$33.7 million in 1995.

Joint items—Joint committees—printing, economic, taxation—have been cut by 22.8 percent overall.

Office of Technology Assessment—has been eliminated, a \$22 million savings.

Congressional Budget Office—has been given \$1.1 million and 13 more FTE's to perform unfunded mandates workload.

Architect of the Capitol—has been cut \$16.8 million below 1995. The conference agreement ends the subsidy to the Flag Office. Flag prices will be raised to reimburse the cost of the flag

raising operation. Requests for proposal will be issued to privatize custodial and maintenance work, and a panel of outside experts will propose how the powerplant can be privatized.

Government Printing Office—has been cut \$7.9 million below 1995. Congressional printing has been cut by \$5.6 million, including no more constituent copies of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The number of daily records printed will be reduced from 17,791 to 11,370, and we have eliminated free copies of documents to judges, to former Members, to press and other media, and to executive agencies.

Library of Congress—funding increased \$1.5 million—only increase in bill. The national digital library pro-

gram of the Library is funded at \$3 million, the amount requested.

General Accounting Office—cut \$75 million below 1995. The report indicates our intent to reduce GAO by 25 percent over a two-year period.

SUMMARY

In summary, the bill is \$205.7 million below fiscal year 1995. It effects a 2,614 reduction in full-time-equivalent jobs; that's a 9.5 percent cut, not including Senate jobs. In total, it is a \$432.8 million reduction below the requests included in the President's budget, a 16.5 percent reduction. Finally, it is \$114.7 million below our 602(b) target allocation.

Every Member can justify an "aye" vote on passage.

FY 1996 LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1854)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - CONGRESSIONAL OPERATIONS						
SENATE						
Mileage and Expense Allowances						
Mileage of the Vice President and Senators	60,000	60,000				-60,000
Expense allowances:						
Vice President	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000	
President Pro Tempore of the Senate	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000	
Majority Leader of the Senate	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000	
Minority Leader of the Senate	10,000	10,000		10,000	10,000	
Majority Whip of the Senate	5,000	5,000		5,000	5,000	
Minority Whip of the Senate	5,000	5,000		5,000	5,000	
Chairman of the Majority Conference Committee	3,000	3,000		3,000	3,000	
Chairman of the Minority Conference Committee	3,000	3,000		3,000	3,000	
Subtotal, expense allowances	56,000	56,000		56,000	56,000	
Representation allowances for the Majority and Minority Leaders	30,000	30,000		30,000	30,000	
Total, Mileage and expenses allowances	146,000	146,000		86,000	86,000	-60,000
Salaries, Officers and Employees						
Office of the Vice President	1,513,000	1,549,000		1,513,000	1,513,000	
Office of the President Pro Tempore	457,000	469,000		325,000	325,000	-132,000
Offices of the Majority and Minority Leaders	2,195,000	2,248,000		2,195,000	2,195,000	
Offices of the Majority and Minority Whips	658,000	672,000		658,000	658,000	
Conference committees	1,992,000	2,040,000		1,992,000	1,992,000	
Offices of the Secretaries of the Conference of the Majority and the Conference of the Minority	384,000	384,000		380,000	380,000	-24,000
Policy Committees				1,930,000	1,930,000	+1,930,000
Office of the Chaplain	182,000	201,000		182,000	182,000	
Office of the Secretary	12,961,000	13,280,000		12,128,000	12,128,000	-833,000
Office of the Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper	32,739,000	35,399,000		31,879,000	31,889,000	-850,000
Offices of the Secretaries for the Majority and Minority	1,197,000	1,225,000		1,047,000	1,047,000	-150,000
Agency contributions and related expenses	17,052,000	18,386,000		15,500,000	15,500,000	-1,552,000
Total, salaries, officers and employees	71,338,000	75,841,000		69,717,000	69,727,000	-1,611,000
Office of the Legislative Counsel of the Senate						
Salaries and expenses	3,381,000	3,543,500		3,381,000	3,381,000	
Office of Senate Legal Counsel						
Salaries and expenses	936,000	985,000		936,000	936,000	
Expense Allowances of the Secretary of the Senate, Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate, and Secretaries for the Majority and Minority of the Senate: Expenses allowances	12,000	12,000		12,000	12,000	
Contingent Expenses of the Senate						
Senate policy committees	2,574,000	2,672,000				-2,574,000
Inquiries and Investigations	78,112,000	78,863,000		66,395,000	66,395,000	-11,717,000
Expenses of United States Senate Caucus on International Narcotics Control	348,000	379,000		305,000	305,000	-43,000
Secretary of the Senate	1,988,500	1,988,500		1,266,000	1,266,000	-700,500
(By transfer)	(7,000,000)					(-7,000,000)
Sergeant at Arms and Doorkeeper of the Senate	74,894,000	72,234,000		61,347,000	61,347,000	-13,547,000
Miscellaneous items	7,426,000	7,429,000		6,844,000	6,844,000	-785,000
Senators' Official Personnel and Office Expense Account	206,542,000	222,663,000		204,029,000	204,029,000	-2,513,000
Office of Senate Fair Employment Practices	889,000	890,000		778,000	778,000	-111,000
Settlements and Awards Reserve	1,000,000	1,000,000		1,000,000	1,000,000	
Stationery (revolving fund)	13,000	13,000		13,000	13,000	
Official Mail Costs						
Expenses	11,000,000	36,300,000		11,000,000	11,000,000	
Total, contingent expenses of the Senate	384,767,500	424,409,500		352,777,000	352,777,000	-31,990,500
Total, Senate	460,580,500	504,937,000		426,908,000	426,919,000	-33,661,500
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 1/						
Payments to Widows and Heirs of Deceased Members of Congress						
Gratuities, deceased Members	267,200					-267,200
Salaries and Expenses						
House Leadership Offices						
Office of the Speaker	1,444,000	1,800,000	1,478,000	1,478,000	1,478,000	+34,000
Office of the Majority Floor Leader	1,220,784	1,114,000	1,470,000	1,470,000	1,470,000	+249,236
Office of the Minority Floor Leader	1,445,413	1,525,000	1,480,000	1,480,000	1,480,000	+34,587

1/ Enacted and request reflect current organization of House funding.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MORAN].

Mr. MORAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to see Cal Ripkin break that record as much as anybody, but, you know, there are other people's lives at stake here in this bill.

I rise in opposition to the bill. One reason is it eliminates the Office of Technology Assessment. I think it is important that the Members understand fully what this bill does. For one, it eliminates the Office of Technology Assessment, the studies they do, technical studies, studies that give us information we could not get otherwise. They are overseen by a bipartisan board.

It is going to make us much more reliant upon the high-priced lobbyists that represent the billion-dollar telecommunications industry or whatever others may have a vested interest.

It eliminates 25 percent of the General Accounting Office. Think of the millions of dollars that have been saved every year by GAO. Yet we are going to tell them that a quarter of GAO is expendable. I think that is penny wise and pound foolish.

But most importantly, my friends in this Chamber, we need to know what this does to the lives of those people that have devoted their lives to serving this institution.

I would like you to focus for a moment on someone like Nancy Glorius. She started working for this institution when she was 15 years old. She has worked for the House of Representatives for 34 years, helping the House buy anything from paper clips to computer networks, has always done a good job. You know what, she just received a form letter, pink slip, without so much as her name on it, after spending 34 years of her life serving this institution; people like Charles Hoag, who worked here 24 years and was let go just months before his retirement and replaced with higher paid employees. This is not right.

This institution will not serve us, more importantly the American people, if this is the way we conduct ourselves.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. THOMAS], chairman of the Committee on House Oversight.

(Mr. THOMAS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], and the ranking member, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the chairman of the Subcommittee on Legislative Appropriations, the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD], and the ranking member, the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO], because the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] also serves

as the ranking member on House oversight.

I think the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] made the point this is an absolute reduction. It is a cut. This is a change from previous Congresses.

□ 1745

Notwithstanding the desire not to make reductions or cuts, I still want to compliment everyone involved because I think it was done in the fairest manner and in the most efficient way possible. We took the major cuts ourselves. We eliminated three committees. Fully 30 percent of the money, 29 million, came out of the committees.

So, I think by example we have indicated where we want to go. The 25-percent General Accounting Office cut was recommended by the General Accounting Office. All we did was accept it. We have more changes coming. Look at the new handbook which my colleagues have received. This is just the beginning.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROEMER].

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I have never voted for a legislative appropriations bill in the 4 years that I have been in Congress. But for the first time, in a bipartisan way, in order to balance the budget, in order to work together across aisles, and I hope this is a vanguard in the next few weeks and months, I will vote for this bill. It makes tough choices toward balancing the budget. It cuts 33 percent out of our mail accounts. It cuts money from the clerk hire. It cuts money from the General Accounting Office and the Office of Technology Assessment.

Yes, my colleagues, if we are going to more toward balancing the budget, which I fully endorse, Congress has to take the first step and share in the sacrifice.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, we were successful in working with the gentleman from New Jersey and getting a Roemer-Zimmer amendment attached. If my colleagues save money in their office account, that money will go for the U.S. deficit.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. NUSSLE].

Mr. NUSSLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to engage with the gentleman from California [Mr. Packard] in a colloquy.

Mr. Packard, in reviewing the conference report language, it appears that the intent of the subcommittee is to prohibit all moves by Members of their offices. As my colleague knows, as part of the transition we are attempting to consolidate Member offices, consolidate split suites where there are two rooms and one room that is located elsewhere. We want to make sure that the bipartisan building commission, as part of the transition, still has the ability to consolidate suites, and I want to make sure that even

though there is a prohibition, that that prohibition is more if a Member's term is limited for one reason or another by death or resignation and not for the incidental consolidation Members' suites.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NUSSLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. The subcommittee recognizes that the bipartisan Building Commission may need some flexibility in fulfilling its goal of consolidating office space, including eliminating split suites. It is not the intent of the subcommittee to prohibit such moves authorized by the bipartisan Building Commission.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY], the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I do support the cuts in this bill, but I do not believe that Congress ought to be exempted from the negotiating squeeze if, in fact, the entire national budget is headed for a train wreck. The President has indicated that, if we send this bill to him before other issues are resolved, he will veto it. That is not going to be in anybody's interest, so it seems to me what we ought to do is to delay the sending of this bill to the President.

That is why the motion to recommit, which I will offer in just a moment, will do just that. It will simply recommit the conference report to the committee with instructions that the conference not meet until subsequently instructed to do so by the House pursuant to clause 1(c) of rule XXVIII. That would simply facilitate the delaying of this bill until other budget issues are worked out in other appropriation bills so that we are not in the unseemly position of appearing to be trying to speed passage through of the bill that funds our agencies while other agencies are going to get caught in the squeeze.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume in response to the motion to recommit.

Let us look at the motion to recommit. It delays. If my colleagues want gridlock, if my colleagues want a so-called train wreck, then vote for this motion to recommit. The best way to avoid a train wreck is to do what we are supposed to do, and that is pass appropriations bills.

What is wrong with the conference report the way it is? I do not think there is anything wrong with it. It cuts below last year's bill. Could it be that those who want to hold this bill are opposed to deficit reduction? We are supposed to be bringing about deficit reduction. That's what this conference report does. It also makes significant reforms in the legislative branch.

Vote against delay. Vote against the motion to recommit.

Since the first of the year Republicans have set an aggressive legislative agenda. Now we are bringing the

fruits of our labors to our colleagues. Let us move forward. Vote for deficit reduction, vote against delay, vote against the motion to recommit.

This motion to recommit the bill to conference is an unprecedented action since I have been here. It is designed to remove control of the legislative agenda from the majority. It is designed to delay the appropriations process. It is designed to give the President control over the legislative branch of Government. I would ask the Members to oppose the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from California [Mr. FAZIO] is through, I will yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman from California going to have a colloquy with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER]?

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FAZIO of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I do not see that on the table right now.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, I think it might be important simply to reference the concern the gentleman had, however.

Mr. PACKARD. There has been some concern, particularly by the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, that our bill would change the reduction in force of GAO as it affects, as it might affect, veterans' preference. We have discussed this with Mr. BUYER, chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs subcommittee. I have a letter from the GAO, and I would submit it for the RECORD. It is to Mr. Detweiler, the National Commander of the American Legion, who has posed the problem in a letter of August 22, 1995. The Comptroller General's, Mr. Charles Bowsher letter assures the veterans that there is no intention of undermining veterans' preference, and certainly I think this issue is cleared up as far as my understanding of the bill is concerned. There apparently has been a misunderstanding of section 212 of the conference report. Mr. Bowsher's letter clears that up. And both Mr. BUYER and I wanted to make sure this is clarified.

The letters referred to are as follows:

COMPTROLLER GENERAL
OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, September 1, 1995.

Mr. WILLIAM DETWEILER,
National Commander, The American Legion,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. DETWEILER: I am very troubled by the August 22 letter, which you sent to members of Congress. Your assertion that section 211 of H.R. 1854 (the legislative branch appropriations bill) would result in an erosion of veterans' preference is erroneous.

Section 211 provides no exemption from the statutory requirement for veterans' preference in a reduction-in-force. On the contrary, section 211 specifically requires that GAO recognize veterans' preference in developing its reduction-in-force rules. GAO will do so.

Beyond this bill, GAO's enabling legislation requires that the agency accord employees the same preferences, including veterans' preference, that are provided to employees in the executive branch.

I assure you that we have no intention of undermining veterans' preference. Indeed, GAO is committed to preserving veterans' preference and will accord veterans the same rights as they would receive during reductions-in-force in executive branch agencies.

I would be happy to meet with you to discuss this matter further. I hope you will join us in correcting any misunderstanding your letter has created about the effect of section 211 on veterans' preference.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES A. BOWSHER,
Comptroller General of the United States.

—
THE AMERICAN LEGION,
Washington, DC, August 22, 1995.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The American Legion is requesting that you oppose the conference report on H.R. 1854, the FY 1996 appropriations bill for the Legislative Branch.

The American Legion is strongly opposed to section 211 of H.R. 1854, a provision that will allow the General Accounting Office to place less emphasis on veterans' preference in reduction-in-force situations. The American Legion believes this is a major step in the erosion of veterans' preference for employment purposes.

"The Veterans' Preference Act of 1944" was enacted by Congress to assist veterans seeking employment because their military service prevented them from earning promotions and benefits in the civilian work force like their civilian counterparts. Unlike affirmative action programs, veterans' preference requires that veterans must be fully qualified and competitive for the preference to apply. The law simply provides preference to a veteran in obtaining and retaining federal employment provided the candidates or employees have equal qualifications.

The American Legion requests that you preserve America's contract with veterans and oppose the conference report for H.R. 1854. Thank you for the continued leadership on important veterans issues.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM M. DETWEILER,
National Commander.

Mr. FAZIO of California. Mr. Speaker, first of all I do want to reference the last point made by my friend from California. I have been on the phone with the Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs, Ed Scott. It is the administration's position that unless the language is changed, the Comptroller General would retain the authority to pay less attention to veterans' preference. I appreciate the concern that I know the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BUYER] had, and I know that the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] has just indicated he shares, but I do think it is important that we point out for the record that this concern remains extant in the executive branch, and I also want to join with the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] in saying it is not the intent of either the majority or the minority to have that effect, but I would, for further clarification, include the letter from Jesse Brown, the Secretary of Veterans Affairs, in the RECORD at this time:

THE SECRETARY OF
VETERANS AFFAIRS,

Washington, DC, September 6, 1995.

Hon. VIC FAZIO,

Ranking Minority Member, Subcommittee on
Legislative, Committee on Appropriations,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FAZIO: I am deeply concerned about a provision in the conference report on H.R. 1854, the proposed Legislative Appropriations Act for FY 1996, that could erode veterans' preference under a downsizing of the General Accounting Office.

Section 212 of the conference report, which originated in the Senate, would authorize the Comptroller General to give less weight to veterans' preference in any reduction-in-force that GAO carries out under this legislation.

This provision overlooks the vitally important role of veterans' preference in America's sacred contract with her defenders. The week after we commemorated our great victory in World War II and a month after the dedication of the Korean War Memorial is no time for the Congress to permit any dilution of our obligations to our warriors. The suggestion that something less than strict adherence to veterans' preference would be acceptable is a slap in the face to all those who have served and sacrificed in defense of freedom and democracy.

I hope you agree with me that legislation, such as H.R. 1854, allowing the weakening of veterans preference must not be enacted.

Sincerely,

JESSE BROWN.

Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the motion offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. OBEY] to recommit, I want to say very clearly that I would never advocate a veto of this bill by any President of either party. I have never in the time I have managed this bill as chairman of this subcommittee seen that likelihood carried out by President Reagan or President Bush. But I think we all understand that none of us want to be treated differently in this branch of Government than anyone else in Government.

We want to make that clear to all the people who are observing our proceedings. If we are going to be asking loyal and hard-working Federal employees to take furloughs and to have their lives disrupted, certainly the American public would think it important that we share in that same struggle, that same burden. It would only be fitting that we, therefore, indicate our interests in being treated alike.

So, Mr. Speaker, I believe the motion to recommit would instruct the conferees to wait until further progress has been made on the other appropriations bills, would not tempt the White House to issue a veto, and is a middle ground that perhaps some of us would seek short of having a confrontation on an issue that ought to be treated with comity by both the executive and legislative branch.

Mr. Speaker, just in completing my remarks, I want to pay tribute once again to the gentleman from California [Mr. PACKARD] who has done an outstanding job in his first voyage as chairman of this subcommittee under very difficult circumstances. I voted for this bill when it passed the House, and, as a courtesy to him, I signed the

conference report. The conference does make some significant improvements. It provides additional funds to CBO to handle the needs of unfunded mandate analysis, which we recently gave them. It restores additional FTE's to the Government Printing Office, it restores funds for our depository libraries around the country, it reestablishes the Joint Committee on Printing, it restores the Folk Life Center at the Library, and restores funding to the Library of Congress. For many Members an important provision: It keeps the Flag Office alive, although the cost of flags will rise to cover the full cost of the dissemination.

But sadly it goes too deep in its cuts in the GAO, more than a 15-percent cut below last year, and most regrettably, and I share this with the gentleman from New York [Mr. HOUGHTON], our colleague who chairs the board that guides the Office of Technology Assessment, rather than support the House position that kept OTA alive under the Library of Congress, it actually does away with the entity. So for those two reasons, Mr. Speaker, regrettably I must oppose this conference report.

Mr. Speaker, my most popular remark of the evening: I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. PACKARD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, if Congress sent as the first appropriations bill the Labor-HHS or some other appropriations bill with an 8- or 9-percent cut to the President, do my colleagues know what we would hear from the President? Why do you not cut yourselves first before cutting these other agencies?

We are cutting ourselves first. We think that is appropriate. This is a model for the rest of the appropriations bills. We are proud to send it to the President first, but we think it will be accompanied by several other bills. I urge the Members to vote for it and to vote against the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, today, we in Congress, under the leadership of the Republican majority, have the opportunity to end business as usual in Government. We have the opportunity to prove to the American people that the change they voted for last November has not fallen on deaf ears.

Through the hard work and diligence of both the House and the Senate, we have crafted a legislative branch appropriations bill that cuts spending and returns sanity to congressional expenditure. This bill indicates just how serious we are about reshaping Government. By cutting our own budget, we have set the standard for every other Federal agency and taken the first crucial step toward a brighter, more prosperous future for our children.

I would encourage all of my colleagues to support H.R. 1854.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. OBEY

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. OBEY. At the present time, Mr. Speaker, yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. OBEY moves to recommit the conference report on H.R. 1854 (H. Rept. 104-212) to the Committee on Conference with instruction that the conferees not meet until subsequently instructed to do so by the House pursuant to clause 1(C) of rule XXVIII.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 164, noes 243, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 637]

AYES—164

Abercrombie	Gephardt	Obey
Ackerman	Gibbons	Oliver
Baessler	Gonzalez	Orton
Baldacci	Gordon	Owens
Barcia	Green	Pallone
Barrett (WI)	Gutierrez	Pastor
Becerra	Hall (OH)	Payne (NJ)
Beilenson	Hamilton	Payne (VA)
Bentsen	Harman	Pelosi
Berman	Hastings (FL)	Peterson (FL)
Bevill	Hefner	Peterson (MN)
Bonior	Hilliard	Pickett
Borski	Hinchey	Pomeroy
Browder	Holden	Poshard
Brown (CA)	Jackson-Lee	Rangel
Brown (OH)	Jacobs	Reed
Bryant (TX)	Jefferson	Richardson
Clay	Johnson, E.B.	Rivers
Clayton	Johnson (SD)	Rose
Clement	Johnston	Roybal-Allard
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Rush
Coleman	Kaptur	Sanders
Collins (IL)	Kennedy (MA)	Sawyer
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (RI)	Schroeder
Condit	Kennelly	Schumer
Conyers	Kildee	Scott
Costello	Kleczka	Skaggs
Coyne	Klink	Slaughter
Cramer	LaFalce	Spratt
Danner	Lantos	Stark
DeFazio	Levin	Stockman
DeLauro	Lewis (GA)	Stokes
Dellums	Lipinski	Studds
Deutsch	Lofgren	Stupak
Dicks	Lowe	Tanner
Dingell	Luther	Thompson
Dixon	Manton	Thornton
Doggett	Markey	Thurman
Dooley	Martinez	Torres
Doyle	Mascara	Torricelli
Durbin	Matsui	Towns
Edwards	McCarthy	Velázquez
Engel	McDermott	Vento
Eshoo	McHale	Visclosky
Evans	McNulty	Volkmer
Farr	Meehan	Ward
Fazio	Meek	Waters
Fields (LA)	Menendez	Watt (NC)
Filner	Miller (CA)	Williams
Flake	Mineta	Wise
Foglietta	Minge	Woolsey
Ford	Mink	Wyden
Frank (MA)	Moran	Wynn
Frost	Nadler	Yates
Gejdenson	Neal	

NOES—243

Allard	Frelinghuysen	Myers
Andrews	Frisa	Myrick
Archer	Funderburk	Nethercutt
Armey	Furse	Neumann
Bachus	Gallegly	Ney
Baker (CA)	Ganske	Norwood
Baker (LA)	Gekas	Nussle
Ballenger	Gilchrest	Ortiz
Barr	Gillmor	Oxley
Barrett (NE)	Gilman	Packard
Bartlett	Goodlatte	Parker
Barton	Goodling	Paxon
Bass	Goss	Petri
Bateman	Graham	Pombo
Bereuter	Greenwood	Porter
Bilbray	Gunderson	Portman
Bilirakis	Gutknecht	Pryce
Bliley	Hall (TX)	Quillen
Blute	Hancock	Quinn
Boehlert	Hansen	Radanovich
Boehner	Hastert	Rahall
Bonilla	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad
Bono	Hayes	Regula
Boucher	Hayworth	Roberts
Brewster	Hefley	Roemer
Brownback	Heineman	Rogers
Bryant (TN)	Herger	Rohrabacher
Bunn	Hilleary	Ros-Lehtinen
Bunning	Hobson	Roth
Burr	Hoekstra	Roukema
Burton	Hoke	Royce
Buyer	Horn	Salmon
Callahan	Hostettler	Sanford
Calvert	Houghton	Saxton
Camp	Hunter	Scarborough
Canady	Hutchinson	Schaefer
Castle	Hyde	Schiff
Chabot	Inglis	Seastrand
Chambliss	Istook	Sensenbrenner
Chapman	Johnson (CT)	Shadegg
Chenoweth	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Christensen	Jones	Shays
Chrysler	Kasich	Shuster
Clinger	Kelly	Skeen
Coble	Kim	Skelton
Coburn	King	Smith (MI)
Collins (GA)	Kingston	Smith (TX)
Combest	Klug	Smith (WA)
Cooley	Knollenberg	Solomon
Cox	Kolbe	Souder
Crane	LaHood	Spence
Crapo	Largent	Stearns
Creameans	Latham	Stenholm
Cubin	LaTourette	Stump
Cunningham	Laughlin	Talent
Davis	Lazio	Tate
Deal	Leach	Tauzin
de la Garza	Lewis (CA)	Taylor (MS)
DeLay	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Diaz-Balart	Lightfoot	Tejeda
Dickey	Linder	Thomas
Doolittle	Livingston	Thornberry
Dornan	LoBiondo	Tiahrt
Dreier	Longley	Torkildsen
Duncan	Lucas	Trafficant
Dunn	Manzullo	Upton
Ehlers	Martini	Vucanovich
Ehrlich	McCollum	Walker
Emerson	McCrery	Walsh
English	McHugh	Wamp
Ensign	McInnis	Watts (OK)
Everett	McIntosh	Weldon (FL)
Ewing	McKeon	Weldon (PA)
Fawell	Metcalf	Weller
Fields (TX)	Meyers	White
Flanagan	Mica	Whitfield
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Wicker
Fowler	Molinar	Wolf
Fox	Montgomery	Young (AK)
Franks (CT)	Moorhead	Zeliff
Franks (NJ)	Murtha	Zimmer

NOT VOTING—27

Bishop	McDade	Sabo
Brown (FL)	McKinney	Serrano
Cardin	Mfume	Siskiy
Fattah	Moakley	Smith (NJ)
Foley	Mollohan	Tucker
Geren	Morella	Waldholtz
Hoyer	Oberstar	Waxman
Lincoln	Reynolds	Wilson
Maloney	Riggs	Young (FL)

□ 1816

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Maloney for, with Mr. Foley against.

Mr. TEJEDA changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. FLAKE changed his vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINDER). The question is on the conference report.

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XV, the yeas and nays are ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 305, nays 101, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 638]

YEAS—305

Ackerman	Diaz-Balart	Johnson, E.B.
Allard	Dickey	Johnson, Sam
Andrews	Dixon	Johnson (SD)
Archer	Dooley	Jones
Army	Doolittle	Kaptur
Bachus	Dorman	Kasich
Baesler	Doyle	Kelly
Baker (CA)	Dreier	Kennedy (RI)
Baker (LA)	Duncan	Kim
Baldacci	Dunn	King
Ballenger	Edwards	Kingston
Barcia	Ehlers	Klecza
Barr	Ehrlich	Klug
Barrett (NE)	Emerson	Knollenberg
Barrett (WI)	English	Kolbe
Bartlett	Ensign	LaHood
Barton	Eshoo	Largent
Bass	Everett	Latham
Bateman	Ewing	LaTourette
Bentsen	Farr	Laughlin
Bereuter	Fawell	Lazio
Bevill	Fields (TX)	Leach
Bilbray	Flake	Lewis (CA)
Bilirakis	Flanagan	Lewis (KY)
Bliley	Forbes	Lightfoot
Blute	Ford (TN)	Linder
Boehlert	Fowler	Lipinski
Boehner	Fox	Livingston
Bonilla	Frank (MA)	LoBiondo
Bono	Franks (CT)	Lofgren
Borski	Franks (NJ)	Longley
Boucher	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Brewster	Frisa	Luther
Brown (OH)	Funderburk	Manton
Brownback	Furse	Manzullo
Bryant (TN)	Gallely	Martini
Bunn	Ganske	Mascara
Bunning	Gekas	McCarthy
Burr	Gilchrest	McCollum
Burton	Gillmor	McCrery
Buyer	Gilman	McHale
Callahan	Goodlatte	McHugh
Calvert	Goodling	McInnis
Camp	Goss	McIntosh
Canady	Graham	McKeon
Castle	Greenwood	McNulty
Chabot	Gunderson	Meehan
Chambliss	Gutknecht	Menendez
Chapman	Hall (OH)	Metcalf
Chenoweth	Hamilton	Meyers
Christensen	Hancock	Mica
Chrysler	Hansen	Miller (FL)
Clayton	Hastert	Mineta
Clement	Hastings (WA)	Minge
Clinger	Hayes	Mink
Coble	Hayworth	Molinari
Coburn	Hefley	Montgomery
Collins (GA)	Heineman	Moorhead
Combest	Herger	Murtha
Cooley	Hilleary	Myers
Costello	Hobson	Myrick
Cox	Hoekstra	Neal
Crane	Hoke	Nethercutt
Crapo	Holden	Neumann
Cremins	Horn	Ney
Cubin	Hostettler	Norwood
Cunningham	Houghton	Nussle
Danner	Hunter	Ortiz
Davis	Hutchinson	Orton
de la Garza	Hyde	Oxley
Deal	Inglis	Packard
DeFazio	Istook	Pallone
DeLay	Jackson-Lee	Parker
Deutsch	Johnson (CT)	Paxon

Payne (VA)	Schiff	Thornberry
Peterson (MN)	Schumer	Tiahrt
Petri	Seastrand	Torkildsen
Pombo	Sensenbrenner	Torricelli
Porter	Shadegg	Towns
Portman	Shaw	Trafigant
Poshard	Shays	Upton
Pryce	Shuster	Visclosky
Quillen	Skeen	Vucanovich
Quinn	Skelton	Walker
Radanovich	Smith (MI)	Walsh
Ramstad	Smith (TX)	Wamp
Rangel	Smith (WA)	Waters
Reed	Solomon	Watts (OK)
Regula	Souder	Weldon (FL)
Rivers	Spence	Weldon (PA)
Roberts	Spratt	Weller
Roemer	Stearns	White
Rogers	Stockman	Whitfield
Rohrabacher	Stump	Wicker
Ros-Lehtinen	Stupak	Wise
Roukema	Roth	Wolf
Royce	Tate	Woolsey
Salmon	Tauzin	Wyden
Saxton	Taylor (MS)	Young (AK)
Scarborough	Taylor (NC)	Zeliff
Schaefer	Tejeda	Zimmer
	Thomas	

NAYS—101

Abercrombie	Green	Pelosi
Becerra	Gutierrez	Peterson (FL)
Beilenson	Hall (TX)	Pickett
Berman	Harman	Pomeroy
Bonior	Hastings (FL)	Rahall
Browder	Hefner	Richardson
Brown (CA)	Hilliard	Rose
Bryant (TX)	Hinchey	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Jacobs	Rush
Clyburn	Jefferson	Sanders
Coleman	Johnston	Sanford
Collins (IL)	Kanjorski	Sawyer
Collins (MI)	Kennedy (MA)	Schroeder
Condit	Kennelly	Scott
Conyers	Kildee	Skaggs
Coyne	Klink	Slaughter
Cramer	LaFalce	Stark
DeLauro	Lantos	Stenholm
Dellums	Levin	Stokes
Dingell	Lewis (GA)	Studds
Doggett	Lowe	Tanner
Durbin	Markey	Thompson
Engel	Martinez	Thornton
Evans	Matsui	Thurman
Fazio	McDermott	Torres
Fields (LA)	Meek	Velázquez
Filner	Miller (CA)	Vento
Foglietta	Moran	Volkmer
Frost	Nadler	Ward
Gedjenson	Obey	Watt (NC)
Gephardt	Olver	Williams
Gibbons	Owens	Wynn
Gonzalez	Pastor	Yates
Gordon	Payne (NJ)	

NOT VOTING—28

Bishop	McDade	Serrano
Brown (FL)	McKinney	Sisisky
Cardin	Mfume	Smith (NJ)
Dicks	Moakley	Tucker
Fattah	Mollohan	Waldholtz
Foley	Morella	Waxman
Geren	Oberstar	Wilson
Hoyer	Reynolds	Young (FL)
Lincoln	Riggs	
Maloney	Sabo	

□ 1825

The Clerk announced the following pair:

On this vote:

Mrs. Waldholtz for, with Ms. McKinney against.

Mr. PALLONE changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the conference report was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNUAL REPORT ON FEDERAL ADVISORY COMMITTEES 1994—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CHAMBLISS) laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight:

To the Congress of the United States:

As provided by the Federal Advisory Committee Act, as amended (Public Law 92-463; 5 U.S.C. App. 2, 6(c)), I am submitting my second Annual Report on Federal Advisory Committees covering fiscal year 1994.

This report highlights continuing efforts by my Administration to reduce and manage Federal advisory committees. Since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12838, as one of my first acts as President, we have reduced the overall number of discretionary advisory committees by 335 to achieve a net total of 466 chartered groups by the end of fiscal year 1994. This reflects a net reduction of 42 percent over the 801 discretionary committees in existence at the beginning of my Administration—substantially exceeding the one-third target required by the Executive order.

In addition, agencies have taken steps to enhance their management and oversight of advisory committees to ensure these committees get down to the public's business, complete it, and then go out of business. I am also pleased to report that the total aggregate cost of supporting advisory committees, including the 429 specifically mandated by the Congress, has been reduced by \$10.5 million or by over 7 percent.

On October 5, 1994, my Administration instituted a permanent process for conducting an annual comprehensive review of all advisory committees through Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-135, "Management of Federal Advisory Committees." Under this planning process, agencies are required to review all advisory committees, terminate those no longer necessary, and plan for any future committee needs.

On July 21, 1994, my Administration forwarded for your consideration a proposal to eliminate 31 statutory advisory committees that were no longer necessary. The proposal, introduced by then Chairman GLENN of the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs as S. 2463, outlined an additional \$2.4 million in annual savings possible through the termination of these statutory committees. I urge the Congress to pursue this legislation—adding to it if possible—and to also follow our example by instituting a review process for statutory advisory committees to ensure they are performing a necessary mission and have not outlived their usefulness.